

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 5, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview granted to Applicant's counsel by the Examiner on June 20, 2005. The Examiner called Applicant's counsel to discuss possible amendments to the claims. Applicant's counsel and the Examiner agreed that the cited art of record does not recite at least "controlling the density distribution of the molten resin at the nose portion of the screw."

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,879,077 of Shimizu et al. ("Shimizu") in view of Japanese Publication Number JP 61-121921 of Akira ("Akira"). The Office Action took the position that Shimizu teaches all the elements of the claim except "to retract the screw at a constant backward speed while rotating it," which the Office Action indicates is supplied by Akira. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to recite, “controlling a density distribution of molten resin at a nose portion of the screw.” As discussed during the interview conducted on June 20, 2005, the Examiner has correctly recognized that at least these features of the independent claims are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections to the claims are moot and it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 and related dependent claims be allowed.

Claims 5-8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shimizu in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,540,359 of Yamazaki (“Yamazaki”). The Office Action indicated that Shimizu teaches all the elements of the claims except “to retract the screw while rotating it.” Applicant respectfully submits that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record. As explained above, each of the independent claims recites, among other things, “controlling a density distribution of molten resin at a nose portion of the screw,” which the Examiner has agreed that is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that rejection is moot and it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 and related dependent claims be allowed.

Conclusion


For the reasons explained above, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-12 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. It is

therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-12 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,


for Douglas H. Goldhush (Reg. No. 46,621)
Registration No. 33,125

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DHG:kmp